Beverly Thorp c/o Box 2070 Sunnyvale CA 94087 FC005

FILED

2008 APR 17 P 2: 28

#### **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

Northern District of California San Jose Division

RICHARD W. WIEKING

#### Plaintiffs:

Beverly Thorp

٧.

23 24

33

35

38 39

40 41

42

Defendant:

Judge Robert Atack, et al. Superior Court of Santa Cruz 701 Ocean St. Santa Cruz CA 95060

Does 1 through 99

Case No. C 08 - 01449 JF

Notice of Motion and a Motion For a **Default Judgment** 

## Notice of Motion and a Motion For a Default Judgment

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE on Friday, 20 June 2008, at 9:00 AM, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard in Department 3, fifth floor, in the United State District Court of Northern California, Santa Clara County, located at 280 S. First Street, San Jose, California. The Plaintiff will move the Court for a Default Judgment against the Defendant and Does 1 through 99.

I, Beverly Ann Thorp, a flesh-and-blood woman, a human being, an Authorized Representative and Agent for BEVERLY THORP, sui juris, Ingenuitas juris et de jure, a State National citizen and NOT a Federal Zone citizen. Under a special appearance of Propria Persona, Without Prejudice, under the Uniform Commercial Code, UCC 1-207,

UCC 1-103, and UCC 3-402, have first hand knowledge of the facts stated herein, and being competent in mind and body to testify, declare and affirm the facts stated herein are true correct, complete and admissible as evidence, in all material fact, not misrepresented and are made pursuant to the Laws of the Union of States of America and the California Republic.

UCC 1-207 Sufficiency of reservation.

Any expression indicating any intention to preserve rights is sufficient, such as "without prejudice," "under protest," "under reservation," or "with reservation of all our rights."

The making of a valid reservation of rights preserves whatever rights the person possesses and prevents the loss of such right by application of concepts of waiver or estoppel.

## UCC 1-103 Common law.

The UCC Code is "Complementary" to Common Law which remains in force except where displaced by the Code.

All statutes should be construed in harmony with the Common Law unless there is a clear legislative intent to abrogate Common Law. ... "The UCC Code cannot be read to preclude a Common Law action,"

The essence of procedural due process is fundamental fairness, de Koevend v. Board of Educ., 688 P.2d 219, 227 (Colo. 1984). The parties have a right to be heard when their rights are affected, and in order to enjoy this right they must first be notified. City of Chicago v. American National Bank & Trust Co. (1988), 171 III. App. 3d 680, 688, 121 III. Dec. 608, 525 N.E.2d 915. Due process requires, at a minimum, notice and the opportunity for a meaningful hearing before an impartial tribunal. Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 333, 348-49 (1976).

2 3

4

5 6

7 8

10 11 12

9

14 15

13

17

18

16

19 20

22 23

21

25 26

24

27 28

29 30

#### Statement of Fact

On 14 March 2008, a Summons and Complaint was filed and sent by Certified Mailed to the Defendant Judge Atack and Does 1 through 99 in conformity with California and Federal law.

The summons sent to the Defendant(s) clearly states:

"YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to serve upon [the] Plaintiff an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, [a] judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint."

The Summons was signed by a court clerk, Betty Walton, and stamped with the Court's Seal, dated 14 March 2008. A signed copy of the Proof of Delivery of the Certified Mail of the Summons and Complaint to the Defendant(s) was mail by regular mail to the Court.

On 17 March 2008, Teresa Vega signed the Certified Mail Return Receipt Signature Card for the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint sent to the Defendant(s). A copy of the Return Receipt Signature Card and the Certified Mail Receipt is in Exhibit 1, for your convenience.

The Federal District Court applied the Common Law Mailbox Rule, which provides proof of mailing of a properly addressed communication bearing proper postage creates a nonrebuttable presumption the communication was received. The Common Law Mailbox Rule has taken precedence since 1502. Sorrentino v. United States, 199 F. Supp. 2d 1068, 1078 (D. Colo. 2002).

A letter, package, or other mailable matter is "mailed" when it is properly addressed. stamped with the proper postage, and deposited in a proper place for receipt of mail. Texas Cas. Ins. Co. v. McDonald, Tex. Civ. App. 269 S. W. 2d 456, 457.

29 30 In contract law, unless otherwise agreed or provided by law, acceptance of offer is effective when deposited in mail if properly addressed. Liquorama Inc. v. American National Bank, 86 III App. 3d 974, 41 III Dec. 951, 953, 408 N. E. 2d 373, 375.

If the Federal Mailbox Rule is applied, the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint would have been mailed and received by the Defendant(s) on the 14th of March 2008. This would have made the Defendant's answer due on the 3rd of April 2008.

If the Mailbox Rule is applied on the date (17 March 2008) the Defendant(s) received the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint, then this would have made the Defendant's answer due on the 6th of April 2008.

Today is the 17th of April 2008 and the Defendant's answer still has NOT been received. This is 33 days after the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint was filed, and it is long after the 20 days generously allowed.

The bottom line of all of this is, the Defendant(s) are in **DEFAULT** for failure to answer the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint as required by law and within the required time period. The time to have preformed has now EXPIRED, and the Defendant(s) are now in DEFAULT.

This Motion for a Default Judgment against the Defendant Judge Atack and Does 1 through 99 for failure to answer the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint which ought to have been done, is now being sought. Town of Milton v. Bruso, 111 Vt. 82, 10 A. 2d 203, 205.

Pursuant to Rule 55(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure the Defendant Judge Atack and Does 1 through 99 have failed to file the required pleading or answer the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint or otherwise defend the above-captioned action.

7

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17 18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

Specifically, the Defendant Judge Atack and Does 1 through 99 have failed to perform a legal duty. Easterwood v. Willingham, Tex. Civ. App., 47 S. W. 2d 393, 395.

The Defendant Judge Atack and Does 1 through 99 have failed to contest any fact or law in this case.

Fraud and deceit may arise from silence where there is a duty to speak the truth, as well as from speaking an untruth. Morrison v. Coddington, 662 P. 2d. 155, 135 Ariz. 480(1983).

Silence can only be equated with fraud when there is a legal and moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading. We cannot condone this shocking conduct... This sort of deception will not be tolerated and if this is routine it should be corrected immediately. Norman v. Zieber, 3 Or at 202-03; U.S. v. Prudden, 424 F.2d. 1021; U.S. v. Tweel, 550 F. 2d. 297, 299, 300 (1977).

Judge Atack and Does 1 through 99 failure to answer the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint is tacit consent by them to the validity of these documents and the statements of truths stated therein and for the removal of any controversy without a trial as there are no disputes between the parties to either the material facts or from any inferences to be drawn from these undisputed facts, nor is there any dispute in the question of the laws involved and/or applied. American State Bank of Killdeer v. Hewson, N. D., 411 N. W. 2d 57, 60.

The Defendant and Does 1 through 99 are not infants or incompetent persons, nor are they in the military service.

The Defendant and Does 1 through 99 have been **DEFAULTED** for failure to answer the Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint in the required allotted time.

This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this case and over the Defendants.

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

13 14

12

15 16

17

18 19

21 22

20

23 24

25 26

27 28

29

30

The venue as to the Defendants in the District Court of Northern California is proper.

The Plaintiff has the authority to seek the relief which is being sought.

# The Relief Requested by the Plaintiff

- 1. I request the United States District Court Declare Judge Atack and All of the Does 1 to 99 to be in Permanent Default.
- 2. I request the United States District Court DISQUALIFY Judge Atack IMMEDIATELY and PERMANENTLY.
- 3. I request the United States District Court Declare ALL of Judge Atack's Rulings and Judgments to be NULL and VOID as a result of Judgment.
- 4. I request the United States District Court Declare ALL of Judge Burdick's Rulings and Judgments to be NULL and VOID as a result of Judgment.
- 5. I request the United States District Court to Declare Judge Atack and Judge Burdick and All of the Does 1 to 99 to have operated as individuals NOT in an official capacity representing the State of California in their handling of Santa Cruz County Superior Case, CV 155983, and each individual has yielded up any claim to immunity from prosecution.
- 6. I request the United States District Court to allow me, the Plaintiff, to submit at a later date damage claims and expenses for each above named individuals who are named jointly, severally, and individually.

Further, Beverly Thorp saith naught.

Without Prejudice, UCC 1-207, UCC 1-103, & UCC 3-402 17 April 2008 Beverly Thorp, an Authorized Representative and Agent \_\_\_ , In Propria Persona Sui Juris A Free Woman, Sovereign American, with Constitutional Rights intact UCC § 3-402 (b)(1) De Jure Soff, Jus Sanguinis, Coronea, Teste Meipso. Reserving All Rights, Giving Up None. Notice to agent is notice to principal. Noted to principal is notice to agent. All Rights Reserved (UCC1-308) 

### PROOF OF SERVICE / DELIVERY

(CCP § 413.10 - 416.90)

I am a citizen of the California Republic. I am over the age of eighteen years. I am able and willing to testify to the facts stated herein.

I served the following document(s) on all appropriate parties in this action by placing a copy of the said document(s) in a sealed envelope, with postage attached, and deposited it with the U.S. Postal Service.

# Notice of Motion and a Motion For A Default Judgment (FC005)

X I caused such envelope to be deposited in the mail with the U.S. Postal Service. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. Mailed to each of the following:

Judge Robert Atack, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz CA 95060. Judge Paul Burdick, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz CA 95060. Troy Overton, 455 Golden Gate Ave. Ste 11000, San Francisco CA 94102

The Proof of Service / Delivery signed by the authorized courier is on file and is available upon demand.

I am readily familiar with the practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. The above document(s) were deposited with the U.S. Postal Service within the time frame prescribed by law.

I declare, under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and

17 April 2008

Dr. Gené Ritchey

c/o Box 2070

Sunnyvale CA 94087

# **Exhibit**

1

## SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mallpiece, or on the front if space permits.
- 1. Article Addressed to:

JUDGE ROBERT ATACK 701 OREAN St. SANTA CRUZ CA 95060

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY A. Received by (Please Print Clearly) B. Date of Delivery C. Signature ☐ Agent X D. Is delivery address different from ite If YES, enter delivery address below

3.	Service Type					
	Certified Mail	☐ Express Mail				
	Registered	☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise				
	☐ Insured Mail	☐ C.O.D.				
4	Restricted Delivery	? (Extra Fee)				

F1001

Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)

7004 1160 0002 4819 1907

7004 1160 0002 4819 1907

PS Form 3811, July 1999

Domestic Return Receipt

102595-99-M-1789

1907	U.S. Postal Service  CERTIFIED MAIL  (Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)						
	For delivery information visit our website at www.usps.com						
73	SANTA CRUZ C	H & DINOR	IAL				
487	Postage	\$	\$4.60	0271			
딥	Certified Fee		\$2.65	03 Postmark			
000	Return Reciept Fee (Endorsement Required)		\$2.15	Here			
1760	Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)		\$0.00				
17	Total Postage & Fees	\$	\$9.40	03/14/2008			
4007	Sent To  JUDGE ROBERT ATACK  Street, Apt. No.; 701 ORFAN St.  City, State, ZIP+4  SANTA CRUZ CA 95060  PS Form 3800, June 2002  See Reverse for Instructions						